

1 **FINAL**

2
3 **MINUTES OF THE COTTONWOOD HEIGHTS CITY**
4 **ARCHITECTURAL REVIEW COMMISSION MEETING**

5
6 **Thursday, December 8, 2011**

7 **5:00 p.m.**

8 **Cottonwood Heights City Council Chamber**
9 **1265 East Fort Union Boulevard, Suite 250**
10 **Cottonwood Heights, Utah**

11
12 ***ATTENDANCE***

13
14 **Committee Members:**

15
16 Scott Chapman
17 Robyn Taylor
18 Scott Peters
19 Stephen K. Harman
20

City Staff:

Brian Berndt, Planning Director
Morgan Brim, City Planner

21 **ACTION ITEMS**

22
23 The meeting commenced at 5:15 p.m.

24
25 **1.0 Review and Recommendation on a Proposed Design for a Zions Bank Located at**
26 **7015 South Highland Drive.**

27
28 The applicant, Scott Chapman, was present on behalf of Jay Lems who could not be in attendance.
29 The site was identified as the southeast corner of Fort Union Boulevard and Highland Drive. The
30 site is elevated with the proposed building to be set on a platform. Currently, there is a retaining
31 wall against the sidewalk that will be pushed back and additional landscaping will be added.
32 Mr. Chapman stated that a considerable amount of park strip was proposed to accommodate future
33 reconfiguration of the curb alignment to allow for a right-hand turn off of Highland Drive
34 traveling north and an acceleration lane as traffic joins Fort Union Boulevard.
35

36 Mr. Chapman stated that there is a 15% site coverage requirement and they have proposed just less
37 than 30%. The building materials were displayed, which included brick masonry, gray limestone
38 around the entry, and a precast concrete cornice. Mechanical equipment on the roof will be
39 hidden. Turf areas along the street and planting areas with decorative gravel mulch are proposed.
40 Mr. Chapman stated that because of the architectural style, they didn't consider planting shrubs
41 that will grow to be five to six feet tall. The proposed plant materials are meant to stay low and in
42 line with the base architecture. Low-growing red flowering roses were also proposed at the base.
43 The color shown as yellow on the rendering will in actuality be greener. Because of the
44 architectural style, the applicants don't want to confuse the base of the building with too many
45 plant materials. The goal was to instead emphasize the stately architecture.
46

47 (17:25:20) A Commission Member commented that he did not like the lawn around the base of the
48 building. His opinion was that lawn should be used where it is effective and used. His preference

1 was to instead see low water use plant materials in those areas. He also suggested there be
2 greenery around the base of the building. He noted that there is a band of shrubs starting to come
3 around the building but they disappear. If something small enough so as to not obscure the full
4 base of the building were to be carried around the foundation, it would frame the detail of the
5 plantings in the center and give more color at the base. The Commission Member was concerned
6 that the street is very busy and it is a very harsh environment for landscaping. His hope on the
7 planter wall was to trade out the mulch for a hearty groundcover between the top of the wall and
8 the base of the building. Grading issues were discussed. Various alternatives were discussed.

9
10 A request was made to see additional detail on areas in front of the wall. Changes were also
11 proposed to the strip of landscaping around the building. It was noted that the City has some of
12 the most restrictive landscaping requirements in the state. Mr. Chapman remarked that he wanted
13 to accentuate the central portion of the building. It was suggested that evergreen ground cover be
14 considered with foundational plantings. The high cost of planter beds was described as one of the
15 reasons for including lawn areas. In addition, because of the traffic generated in the area, the
16 environment is a difficult one in which to get all of the plants to grow. Mr. Chapman pointed out
17 that the architecture pulls around at which point there is a major change on the opposite side.

18 19 **1.1 Review and Recommendation on Two Proposed Office Buildings Located at 2770** 20 **East Cottonwood Parkway.**

21
22 (17:50:00) Julie Berreth from Architectural Nexus reported that the two proposed office buildings
23 have changed very little from earlier iterations. The newest versions are more updated. The two
24 buildings are proposed just west of the Blue Cross building. Cottonwood Partners Representative,
25 Jeff Gochnour, stated that the neighbors were invited to attend an open house on December 19. At
26 that time, news on the buildings will be inserted into photographs taken from two locations on the
27 property. Blue Cross acquired the parcel when they built their two-building campus. The intent at
28 that time was to expand but they have since determined to discontinue the expansion and the land
29 became available.

30
31 Mr. Gochnour stated that they developed the entire Cottonwood Corporate Center. In planning for
32 this project they worked on site planning and preliminary elevations. He remarked that the
33 process is still in transition and they continue to add details and finishes to the plan. Input from
34 the Commission Members was welcomed.

35
36 Mr. Gochnour stated that when the Cottonwood Corporate Center was initially approved, it was
37 approved for 980,000 square feet. Of the portion that has been developed, roughly 250,000 in
38 density remains. The two proposed buildings together total 250,000 square feet. The building that
39 fronts Cottonwood Parkway is a six-story building with roughly 150,000 square feet. The second
40 is a four-story building comprising approximately 100,000 square feet. These buildings will be
41 similar in scope to the two adjacent buildings. Effort was made to push the buildings as far away
42 from residences as possible with the intent being to find a place on the site that is least obtrusive.
43 Mr. Gochnour stated that the shorter four-story building will be placed closest to the residences on
44 the south. The taller one would be furthest from homes.

45
46 (17:54:50) Ms. Berreth stated that the intent was to keep the buildings as far from residences as
47 possible and feel the strong impact of the building to those traveling through the corporate center.
48 A total of 860 parking stalls were proposed. The parking structure will include one deck over

1 grade recognizing that grade issues exist. Due to the design of the structure and the slope of the
2 site, there will be no internal ramping. One entrance was proposed. Specifics of the site were
3 discussed.

4
5 Proposed fencing and landscaping was discussed. A Commission Member commented that he
6 likes the density of plant materials on the site plan based on the assumption that it was surveyed
7 and that the vegetation shown as existing is correct. If it does not exist, he suggested more plant
8 material be added. He liked that a Plant Protection Plan that identifies guidelines with regard to
9 how to protect the plant material was proposed. He considered that to be critical, especially to
10 ensure that equipment does not drive over the plant roots. He felt that as long as the plant material
11 buffer is maintained around the outside, he would be satisfied with what is proposed. From an
12 architectural perspective, he liked what was proposed. He asked about the sandstone finish and
13 questioned whether it fits with the surroundings. Ms. Berreth stated that the neighborhood has a
14 range of levels of contemporary architecture. One thought was to expand the view beyond the
15 Cottonwood Corporate Center. The idea of muted colors in the buildings was supported by one
16 Commission Member who questioned whether it fits the area. His preference was for more
17 brownish coloring that is more closely tied to this region of the valley. Ms. Berreth appreciated
18 the insight and stated that the intent was to incorporate attractive materials into the architecture.

19
20 Architectural features of the buildings were described. A Commissioner complimented the front
21 entry and the fact that the buildings are pushed up to the street with a buffer between them and
22 residential. He also liked that trees frame the entry and draw attention there. The Commission
23 Member considered the trees on both sides of the street to be important.

24
25 Commissioner Taylor remarked that the proposed buildings will fit in well in the City.
26 Ms. Berreth remarked that they looked very hard at keeping the mechanical equipment off of the
27 roof. The roof design was described.

28 29 **DISCUSSION ITEMS**

30 31 **2.0 Discussion of a Draft Design Standard Manual for the City's Gateway District.**

32
33 (18:17:25) Planning Director, Brian Berndt, reported that a preliminary draft has been prepared of
34 the Draft Design Standard Manual. He asked that the Commission Members review the document
35 and submit comments or changes to staff. The intent was to move the document forward and get
36 something adopted that will provide assistance in architectural discussions. After speaking with
37 UTA and other regional interests, it was discovered that the corridor will become more significant,
38 and redevelopment of the corridor will become even more significant because of aging
39 infrastructure. It was acknowledged that at some point updating, renovation, and renewal efforts
40 will be needed. The hope was for staff to get feedback within the next four weeks at which time
41 staff will proceed.

42 43 **3.0 ADJOURNMENT**

44
45 The Architectural Review Commission Meeting adjourned at 6:22 p.m.

1 *I hereby certify that the foregoing represents a true, accurate and complete record of the*
2 *Cottonwood Heights Architecture Review Commission Meeting held Thursday, December 8, 2011.*

3
4
5
6
7 
8
9

10 Teri Forbes
11 T Forbes Group
12 Minutes Secretary

13
14
15 Minutes approved: